1		
2		
3		
4	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
5		
6	ATTAC	OMA
7	CHARLES S. LONGSHORE,	
8	Plaintiff,	CASE NO. C16-5629BHS
9	v.	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS AND MOTION
10	ROBERT HERZOG, et al.,	FOR RECONSIDERATION
11	Defendants.	
12		
13	This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Charles Longshore's	
14	("Longshore") objections and motion for reconsideration of order denying motion to	
15	appoint counsel (Dkt. 15).	
16	On August 10, 2016, the Honorable J. Richard Creatura, United States Magistrate	
17	Judge, denied Longshore's motion to appoint counsel. Dkt. 11. Judge Creatura	
18	concluded that it was "not possible to determine plaintiff's likelihood of success at this	
19	point in the litigation" and that there were "no exceptional circumstances compelling the	
20	Court to appoint counsel at this time." <i>Id.</i> at 2. On August 12, 2016, Longshore filed the	
21	instant motion objecting to and requesting reconsideration of Judge Creatura's order.	
22	Dkt. 15.	

When reviewing objections to an order on a nondispositive issue, the district judge in the case must consider timely objections and modify or set aside any part of the order that is clearly erroneous or is contrary to law. Fed. R. Civ. P 72(a). In this case, Longshore has failed to show that Judge Creatura's order is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Although Longshore disagrees with the order, nothing prevents appointment of counsel if circumstances become exceptional or Longshore shows a greater likelihood of success on the merits. Therefore, the Court **DENIES** Longshore's motion. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated this 19th day of September, 2016. United States District Judge